



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/531,035

04/12/2005

Mark Thomas Johnson

NL 021026

5048

24737

7590

02/18/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

LAM, VINH TANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,035	Applicant(s) JOHNSON, MARK THOMAS	
	Examiner VINH T. LAM	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims **1** and **13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding Claims **1** and **13**, the specification as originally filed has failed to provide support for the recitation "... wherein **each of the sequence of drive voltages and drive periods** apply to when the pixel is being driven to an optical state **corresponding to input image data ...**". The specification does not reasonably convey one skill in the art how to make or use applicant claimed invention for "... wherein **each of the sequence of drive voltages and drive periods** apply to when the pixel is being driven to an optical state **corresponding to input image data ...**".

The following is a quotation of the **second** paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2629

2. Claims **1** and **13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitation of Claims **1** and **13** "... wherein **each of the sequence of drive voltages and drive periods** apply to when the pixel is being driven to an optical state **corresponding to input image data** ..." is not clear.

The limitation is a contradiction to the application's Abstract, Drawing, and Specification because:

"... *This **control** of the amplitude of the drive voltages and/or the **duration** of the drive periods.*" (**New Abstract**) and

"... the drive **period TD2 is extended from two to four sub-field periods TSFij** and lasts from *t4 to t6 instead of to t5.*" (Col. **5**, [0063], FIG. **3**) which are obvious to one skill in the art that the **duration** of the drive **during the second period** is **modified** from the input image data or **not corresponding to input image data**.

Appropriate correction is required.

To further advance prosecution, the above limitation is interpreted in agreement with the Abstract, Drawing, and Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2629

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims **1-3**, **7-9**, and **13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Handschy et al. (US Patent No. 6507330)**.

Regarding Claim **1**, **Handschy et al.** teach a display apparatus comprising:

a matrix display device comprising a plurality of pixels, an optical state of each pixel being defined by particles moving in a fluid between electrodes dependent on a value and a polarity of a drive voltage and a duration of a drive period during which the drive voltage is present across the pixel (Col. **8**, Ln. **17-34**, FIG. **1**);

a driver for supplying a sequence of drive voltages across the pixel during corresponding successive drive periods (Col. **8**, Ln. **17-34**, FIG. **1**), wherein each of the sequence of drive voltages and drive periods apply to when the pixel is being driven to an optical state corresponding to input image data (i.e. correspondingly **inverse** to input image data; Col. **8**, Ln. **36-42**, FIG. **11**); and

a DC-balancing circuit comprising a controller for determining a time-average value for each pixel, used to adjust at least one of the value of the drive voltage and the duration of the corresponding drive period, to obtain a substantially zero value of the time-average value for each consecutive field of the pixel (Col. **9**, Ln. **31-44**, FIGs. **10 & 13**),

wherein the at least one of the value of the drive voltage and the duration of the corresponding drive period are adjusted in steps corresponding to sub-fields of the field of the pixel (Col. **11**, Ln. **2-9**, FIG. **4**).

Regarding Claim **2**, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein the DC-balancing circuit further comprises a memory, and wherein the controller is adapted for summing in the memory, for the drive period of each pixel, a number indicating a multiplication of the duration of said drive period and the value of the drive voltage supplied during said drive period to said pixel, and adapting the value of the at least one of the value of the drive voltage and the duration of the drive period to obtain a value of the number being as near-to zero as possible, the number corresponding to the time-average value (Col. **9**, Ln. **31-44**, FIGs. **10-13**).

Regarding Claim **3**, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 1, further comprising:

a control circuit for driving the matrix display device in a sub-field mode wherein grey scales corresponding to the sub-field of each pixel are determined by a number of sub-fields receiving the drive voltage during the corresponding field, and wherein the drive period is the duration of the number of sub-fields receiving the drive voltage (Col. **11**, Ln. **2-9**, FIG. **4**).

Regarding Claim **7**, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein a desired coloration of the pixel, after an initial period of time required to obtain the desired coloration, is substantially independent on the duration of the drive period, and wherein the controller is adapted for controlling the duration of the

Art Unit: 2629

drive period to be longer than the initial period when the number indicates that a polarity of the drive voltage is opposite to a plurality of an initial drive voltage corresponding to the initial period (Col. 12, Ln. 33-41, FIG. 8).

Regarding Claim 8, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 7, wherein the controller is adapted for controlling the duration of the drive period not to exceed the initial period when the initial period causes the number to change sign (Col. 13, Ln. 36-50, FIG. 11).

Regarding Claim 9, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein a desired coloration of the pixel, after an initial period of time required to obtain the desired coloration, is substantially independent on the duration of the drive period, and wherein the controller is adapted for controlling the duration of the drive period to be substantially identical to the initial period when the number indicates that a polarity of the drive voltage is the same as a plurality of an initial drive voltage corresponding to the initial period (Col. 13, Ln. 23-35, FIG. 10).

Regarding Claim 13, **Handschy et al.** teach a method of driving a matrix display device comprising a plurality of pixels, an optical state of each pixel being defined by particles moving in a fluid between electrodes dependent on a value and a polarity of a drive voltage and a duration of a drive period during which the drive voltage is present across the pixel, the method comprising:

supplying a sequence of drive voltages across each pixel during corresponding successive drive periods (Col. 8, Ln. 27-34, FIG. 1), wherein each of the sequence of drive voltages and drive periods apply to when the pixel is being driven to an optical

Art Unit: 2629

state corresponding to input image data (i.e. correspondingly **inverse** to input image data; Col. 8, Ln. 36-42, FIG. 11)-; and

adjusting at least one of the drive voltage value and the corresponding drive period duration for each pixel to obtain a substantially zero value of a time-average value for each field of each pixel, based on a product of a drive voltage value and a corresponding drive period duration of a previous consecutive field of the pixel (Col. 9, Ln. 31-44, FIGs. 10-13),

wherein the at least one of the drive voltage value and the corresponding drive period duration are adjusted in steps corresponding to sub-fields of the field of the pixel (Col. 11, Ln. 2-9, FIG. 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Handschy et al. (US Patent No. 6507330) in view of **Admitted Prior Art**.

Regarding Claim 4, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 2.

However, **Handschy et al.** do not teach the controller is adapted for comparing an absolute value of the number with a threshold number to supply a reset pulse to the

Art Unit: 2629

pixel when an absolute value of the number for the pixel surpasses the threshold number.

In the same field of endeavor, **Admitted Prior Art** teaches the controller is adapted for comparing an absolute value of the number with a threshold number to supply a reset pulse to the pixel when an absolute value of the number for the pixel surpasses the threshold number (Col. 2, [0025]) for the benefit of reducing the image retention by having of a DC-balancing circuit further comprising a memory, a controller for adapting a value of at least one a drive voltage and a duration to obtain a value of a number being as near-to zero as possible, wherein the number corresponding to a time-average value, and the controller also comparing an absolute value of the number with a threshold number to supply a reset pulse to the pixel when an absolute value of the number for the pixel surpasses the threshold number.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Handschy et al.** teaching of a DC-balancing circuit further comprising a memory, a controller for adapting a value of at least one a drive voltage and a duration to obtain a value of a number being as near-to zero as possible, wherein the number corresponding to the time-average value with **Admitted Prior Art** teaching of a controller for comparing an absolute value of the number with a threshold number to supply a reset pulse to the pixel when an absolute value of the number for the pixel surpasses the threshold number in order to benefit of reducing the image retention by having of a DC-balancing circuit further comprising a memory, a controller for adapting a value of at least one a drive voltage and a duration to obtain a value of a

Art Unit: 2629

number being as near-to zero as possible, wherein the number corresponding to a time-average value, and the controller also comparing an absolute value of the number with a threshold number to supply a reset pulse to the pixel when an absolute value of the number for the pixel surpasses the threshold number.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Handschy et al. (US Patent No. 6507330)** in view of **Abramson et al. (US Patent No. 6950220)**.

Regarding Claim 5, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 2.

However, **Handschy et al.** do not teach the display device further comprising a temperature sensor for sensing a temperature of the pixel, and wherein the controller is adapted for modifying the number dependent on the temperature.

In the same field of endeavor, **Abramson et al.** teach the display device further comprising a temperature sensor for sensing a temperature of the pixel, and wherein the controller is adapted for modifying the number dependent on the temperature (Col. 20, Ln. 2-7) for the benefit of improving the image quality to compensate for the pixel temperature by having a DC-balancing circuit further comprising a memory, a controller for adapting a value of at least one a drive voltage and a duration to obtain a value of a number being as near-to zero as possible, wherein the number corresponding to the time-average value, and a temperature sensor for sensing a temperature of the pixel,

Art Unit: 2629

and wherein the controller is adapted for modifying the number dependent on the temperature.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Handschy et al.** teaching of a DC-balancing circuit further comprising a memory, a controller for adapting a value of at least one a drive voltage and a duration to obtain a value of a number being as near-to zero as possible, wherein the number corresponding to the time-average value with **Abramson et al.** teaching of the display device further comprising a temperature sensor for sensing a temperature of the pixel, and wherein the controller is adapted for modifying the number dependent on the temperature in order to benefit of improving the image quality to compensate for the pixel temperature by having a DC-balancing circuit further comprising a memory, a controller for adapting a value of at least one a drive voltage and a duration to obtain a value of a number being as near-to zero as possible, wherein the number corresponding to the time-average value, and a temperature sensor for sensing a temperature of the pixel, and wherein the controller is adapted for modifying the number dependent on the temperature.

6. Claims **6** and **10-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Handschy et al. (US Patent No. 6507330)** in view of **Katase (US Patent No. 6961047)**.

Regarding Claim **6**, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 2.

However, **Handschy et al.** do not teach the controller is adapted for modifying the number non- linearly dependent on the value of the drive voltage.

In the same field of endeavor, **Katase** teaches the controller is adapted for modifying the number non- linearly dependent on the value of the drive voltage (Col. **20**, Ln. **2-7**) for the benefit of improving the image quality to correct the non-linearity dependent on the value of the drive voltage by having a DC-balancing circuit further comprising a memory, a controller for adapting a value of at least one a drive voltage and a duration to obtain a value of a number being as near-to zero as possible, wherein the number corresponding to the time-average value, and the controller also modifying the number non- linearly dependent on the value of the drive voltage.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Handschy et al.** teaching of a DC-balancing circuit further comprising a memory, a controller for adapting a value of at least one a drive voltage and a duration to obtain a value of a number being as near-to zero as possible, wherein the number corresponding to the time-average value with **Katase** teaching of the controller for modifying the number non- linearly dependent on the value of the drive voltage in order to benefit of improving the image quality to correct the non-linearity dependent on the value of the drive voltage by having a DC-balancing circuit further comprising a memory, a controller for adapting a value of at least one a drive voltage and a duration to obtain a value of a number being as near-to zero as possible, wherein the number corresponding to the time-average value, and the controller also modifying the number non- linearly dependent on the value of the drive voltage.

Regarding Claim **10**, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 7.

However, **Handschy et al.** do not teach the display device is an electrophoretic display, and the pixel comprises two switching electrodes and a further electrode, the driver being adapted for supplying the sequence of drive voltages to the two switching electrodes and the further electrode controlling intermediate optical states of the pixel.

In the same field of endeavor, **Katase** teaches teach the display device is an electrophoretic display, and the pixel comprises two switching electrodes and a further electrode (Col. 4, Ln. 60-68, Col. 5, Ln. 1-7, FIG.1, & FIG. 2), the driver being adapted for supplying the sequence of drive voltages to the two switching electrodes and the further electrode controlling intermediate optical states of the pixel (Col. 6, Ln. 16-25, FIG. 3) for the benefit of improving the image quality of an electrophoretic display to adapt adjusting at least one of the voltage value and the corresponding drive period duration by having an electrophoretic display, wherein the pixel comprises two switching electrodes and a further electrode, the driver for supplying a sequence of drive voltages to the to control the pixel's optical states, and a desired coloration of the pixel being independent on the duration of the drive period, also the driver controlling the duration of the drive period to be longer than the initial period when the number indicating that a polarity reversed.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Handschy et al.** teaching of a desired coloration of the pixel being independent on the duration of the drive period, and the driver for

Art Unit: 2629

controlling the duration of the drive period to be longer than the initial period when the number indicating that a polarity reversed with **Katase** teaching of including an electrophoretic display, wherein the pixel comprises two switching electrodes and a further electrode, and the driver for supplying a sequence of drive voltages to the to control the pixel's optical states in order to benefit of improving the image quality of an electrophoretic display to adapt adjusting at least one of the voltage value and the corresponding drive period duration by having an electrophoretic display, wherein the pixel comprises two switching electrodes and a further electrode, the driver for supplying a sequence of drive voltages to the to control the pixel's optical states, and a desired coloration of the pixel being independent on the duration of the drive period, also the driver controlling the duration of the drive period to be longer than the initial period when the number indicating that a polarity reversed.

Regarding Claim **11**, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 7, wherein the driver is adapted for supplying the sequence of drive voltages between the at least two electrodes for setting a grey scale of the pixel by providing a drive voltage lower than a usually applied drive voltage which sets a grey level by modulating the duration of the drive period during which the usually applied drive voltage is present (Col. **12**, Ln. **33-41**, FIG. **8**).

However, **Handschy et al.** do not teach wherein the display device is an electrophoretic display, and wherein the pixel comprises at least two electrodes.

In the same field of endeavor, **Katase** teaches the display device is an electrophoretic display, and wherein the pixel comprises at least two electrodes (Col. **4**,

Art Unit: 2629

Ln. **60-68**, Col. **5**, Ln. **1-7**, FIG.1, & FIG. 2) for the benefit of improving the image quality of an electrophoretic display to adapt adjusting at least one of the voltage value and the corresponding drive period duration by having an electrophoretic display, wherein the pixel comprises at least two electrodes, the driver for supplying a sequence of drive voltages to the to control the pixel's optical states, and a desired coloration of the pixel being independent on the duration of the drive period, also the driver controlling the duration of the drive period to be longer than the initial period when the number indicating that a polarity reversed.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Handschy et al.** teaching of a desired coloration of the pixel being independent on the duration of the drive period, and the driver for controlling the duration of the drive period to be longer than the initial period when the number indicating that a polarity reversed with **Katase** teaching of including an electrophoretic display, and wherein the pixel comprises at least two electrodes in order to benefit of improving the image quality of an electrophoretic display to adapt adjusting at least one of the voltage value and the corresponding drive period duration by having an electrophoretic display, wherein the pixel comprises at least two electrodes, the driver for supplying a sequence of drive voltages to the to control the pixel's optical states, and a desired coloration of the pixel being independent on the duration of the drive period, also the driver controlling the duration of the drive period to be longer than the initial period when the number indicating that a polarity reversed.

Regarding Claim **12**, **Handschy et al.** teach the display apparatus as claimed in claim 1.

However, **Handschy et al.** do not teach the display device is an electrophoretic display.

In the same field of endeavor, **Katase** teaches the display device is an electrophoretic display (Col. **4**, Ln. **60-68**, Col. **5**, Ln. **1-7**, FIG. **1**, & FIG. **2**) for the benefit of improving the image quality of an electrophoretic display including a plurality of pixels, an optical state of each pixel dependent polarity of a drive voltage and a duration, a driver for supplying a sequence of drive voltages and periods corresponding to input image data, and a DC-balancing circuit determining a time-average value for each pixel, to adjust one of the drive voltage and the duration to obtain a substantially zero value of the time-average for each consecutive field of the pixel, wherein at least one of the drive voltage and the duration being adjusted in steps corresponding to sub-fields of the pixel.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Handschy et al.** teaching of a matrix display device comprising a plurality of pixels, an optical state of each pixel dependent polarity of a drive voltage and a duration, a driver for supplying a sequence of drive voltages and periods corresponding to input image data, and a DC-balancing circuit determining a time-average value for each pixel, to adjust one of the drive voltage and the duration to obtain a substantially zero value of the time-average for each consecutive field of the pixel, wherein at least one of the drive voltage and the duration being adjusted in steps

Art Unit: 2629

corresponding to sub-fields of the pixel with **Katase** teaching of the display device being an electrophoretic display in order to benefit of improving the image quality of an electrophoretic display including a plurality of pixels, an optical state of each pixel dependent polarity of a drive voltage and a duration, a driver for supplying a sequence of drive voltages and periods corresponding to input image data, and a DC-balancing circuit determining a time-average value for each pixel, to adjust one of the drive voltage and the duration to obtain a substantially zero value of the time-average for each consecutive field of the pixel, wherein at least one of the drive voltage and the duration being adjusted in steps corresponding to sub-fields of the pixel.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments, see Pages 11-14, filed 11/12/2008, with respect to Claims **1** and **13** have been fully considered and are **not** persuasive.

First of all, in response to applicant's argument that **Handschy et al. (herein after Handschy)** reference fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., non-visible) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Secondly, the examiner respectfully disagrees that **Handschy's** "... wherein the second interval, the voltage and given duration do not correspond to image data"

Art Unit: 2629

because **Handschy** explicitly teach that "... the second period of FIG. 11, however, the drive voltages are doubled to ± 3.0 volts for the non-visible inverse **image** ..." (Col. 13, Ln. 40-42, FIG. 11) which is exactly identical to applicant's New Abstract, namely control "*the amplitude of the drive voltages and/or the **duration** of the drive periods*" which are further disclosed in the Drawing and Specification as "*the drive **period TD2 is extended from two to four sub-field periods** TSFij and lasts from t_4 to t_6 instead of to t_5 .*" (Col. 5, [0063], FIG. 3).

Finally, extension of the TD2 duration is definitely **not** corresponding to input image data on the contrary to Claims 1 and 13 limitation "each of the sequence of drive voltages and drive periods apply to when the pixel is being driven to an optical state corresponding to input image data", therefore, provoking the USC 112 First and Second Paragraph Rejections. Also modifying the duration of the drive periods would alter the gray scale, however, it would be invisible to viewer due to a short extension. As a whole, the applicant's invention is about a DC Balance circuit that controls the amplitude of the drive voltages and/or the duration of the drive periods not a periodical polarity inverting/alternating circuit which is well-known in the art (e.g. **Handschy's** admitted prior art, FIG. 10).

14. Applicant's arguments, see Pages 14-15, filed 11/12/2008, with respect to Claim 4 have been fully considered and are **not** persuasive.

It is true that [0025] is part of the application's embodiment, however, the examiner respectfully disagrees and must interpret the phrase "... a reset pulse is

Art Unit: 2629

supplied to the pixel. This reset pulse operates in the **same manner as in the prior art.**" in [0025] as an admission of prior art used in the embodiment.

Conclusion

The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Ayliffe; Peter J. et al.(US 4728947 A), Knapp; Alan G. et al.(US 5684501 A), and Gates; Holly G.(US 7202847 B2).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VINH T. LAM whose telephone number is (571)270-3704. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-4:30) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on (571) 272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VTL/